Application No 09/305,234
Response dated January 17, 2006
Response to final Office Action mailed November 17, 2005

REMARKS

This Response is in response to the final Office Action mailed November 17, 2005. Claims 1-21 and 33, 35 and 37-40 are pending. No claims were amended or canceled in this Response.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-21, 33, 35 and 37-40 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description. The rejection asserts that there is no basis or suggestion of several amended features in the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification supports the features noted in rejections.

Claims 1, 3 and 8 were rejected for reciting "the user to <u>create</u> the rules." This feature is supported by the original specification at least on pages 181, 182 and 185. The specification notes that a "type of user," referred to as a "task librarian," defines rules which cause tasks to be placed on task lists. (p. 181, lns. 10-15). The specification also notes that the rules are "established by the task librarian." (p. 182, lns. 22-24). The specification also states that an interface "allows task librarians 1502 to define tasks and the rules that create them." (p. 184, lns. 5-7). One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that to define and establish rules supports the recited feature "to <u>create</u> the rules."

Claims 1, 3 and 8 were also rejected for reciting "task which is <u>automatically</u> selected." This feature is supported by the original specification at least on pages

8

Application No 09/305,234
Response dated January 17, 2006
Response to final Office Action mailed November 17, 2005

137, 183 and 184. The specification notes that the task engine application runs as a background process or service with no direct interaction with client applications, and has the main action of "the generation of new tasks in response to externally generated events." (p. 137, lns. 29-32). In the context of the present specification, running in the background suggests that the tasks may be generated or selected automatically. Moreover, the specification expressly discloses that the event processor "enables **automation** based on an almost limitless number of events and responses that could be defined." (p. 183, lns. 24-26). The specification describes the result that "the system **automatically** responds with appropriate **automated activities like generating tasks.**" (p. 184, lns. 20-21). Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the specification supports the recited feature that the tasks are generated by being automatically selected, as claimed. For the above reasons, the rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn from independent claims 1, 8 and 15, and from the dependent claims rejected for depending from these claims (i.e., claims 2, 6-7, 9, 13-14, 16, 18-21 and 37).

Claims 3, 10 and 17 were rejected for reciting "said task is automatically selected based on the event received from the event queue." The original claims, summary of the invention and abstract support this recited feature, but for the "automatically" selected feature. The specification discloses that "[e]vents are then received from any source, such as a common event queue. Finally tasks are selected and outputted based on the received events." (p. 6, lns 17-19; abstract). As noted

Application No 09/305,234
Response dated January 17, 2006
Response to final Office Action mailed November 17, 2005

above with respect to claims 1, 8 and 15, the specification at pages 137, 183 and 184

supports the feature that the task selection is "automatically" performed.

Accordingly, the specification supports this recited feature. For the above reasons,

the rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn from dependent claims 3, 10,

and 17, and from the dependent claim rejected for depending from these claims (i.e.,

claim 4).

Claims 5 and 38 were rejected for reciting "match the event from the event

queue with the predetermined event defined in the rules." This feature is supported

by the original claims and specification. The specification notes that tasks are

selected based on a set of predetermined events, and that events are received from an

event queue. (p. 6, lns16-17; and abstract). The specification also describes that tasks

are selected by "matching claim's characteristics to the [rule for the] task defined in

the task library 1500." (p. 185, lns. 18-20). One of ordinary skill in the art would

understand that this quoted portion of the specification refers not to the task itself, but

to the rule for the task contained in the task library since the specification earlier

noted that the "librarian defines rules which cause tasks to be placed on task lists

based on claim characteristics." (p. 181, lns. 13-15). The specification further

provides an exemplary rule in the form of a template that "might contain a statement

like 'when event=litigation AND line of business=commercial auto, then...' that

provides two elements for matching: (1) an event, and (2) a line of business, the latter

of which is a claim characteristic. Therefore, the specification suggests by the

10

Application No 09/305,234
Response dated January 17, 2006
Response to final Office Action mailed November 17, 2005

exemplary rule that just as claim characteristics may be matched to the rules, so may

events be matched to the rules. One of ordinary skill in the art following Boolean

logic would understand that when a rule contains a predetermined event as a pre-

condition, that it must be matched with the present event from the event queue to

select that task to be outputted, as recited by the claims. For the above reasons, the

rejections are respectfully requested to be withdrawn from dependent claims 5 and 38,

and from the dependent claim rejected for depending from these claims (i.e.,

claim 33).

Claim 39 was rejected for reciting "match the claim characteristic to a

predetermined characteristic defined in the rules." This feature is supported by the

original claims and specification. The specification describes that tasks are selected

by "matching claim's characteristics to the [rule for the] task defined in the task

library 1500." (p. 185, lns. 18-20). One of ordinary skill in the art would understand

that this quoted portion of the specification refers not to the task itself, but to the rule

for the task contained in the task library since the specification earlier noted that the

"librarian defines rules which cause tasks to be placed on task lists based on claim

characteristics". (p. 181, lns. 13-15). The specification further provides an

exemplary rule in the form of a template that "might contain a statement like 'when

event=litigation AND line of business=commercial auto, then...' that provides two

elements for matching: (1) an event, and (2) a line of business, the latter of which is a

claim characteristic. Therefore, the specification suggests by the exemplary rule that

Application No 09/305,234
Response dated January 17, 2006
Response to final Office Action mailed November 17, 2005

claim characteristics are matched to the rules. One of ordinary skill in the art following Boolean logic would understand that when a rule contains a predetermined claim characteristic as a pre-condition, that it must be matched with the present claim characteristic to select that task to be outputted, as recited by the claims. For the above reason, the rejection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn from dependent claim 39, and from the dependent claim rejected for depending from this claim (i.e., claim 40).

Claim 11 was rejected for reciting "the outputted task is automatically selected based on the claim characteristics identified in the rules." The rejection noted that specification failed to support automatically selecting tasks or basing such selection on claim characteristics. As noted above with respect to claim 1, the specification discloses and supports automatically selecting tasks. As noted above with respect to claim 39, the specification discloses and supports that the task may be selected based on the claim characteristics identified in the rules. Accordingly, the specification supports the recited feature. For the above reason, the rejection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn from dependent claim 11, and from the dependent claim rejected for depending from this claim (i.e., claim 35).

Claim 12 was rejected for reciting "said outputted task is automatically selected based on matching the event from the event queue with the predetermined event defined in the rules." The rejection noted that specification failed to support automatically selecting tasks or basing such selection on matching events in an event

12

Application No 09/305,234
Response dated January 17, 2006
Response to final Office Action mailed November 17, 2005

queue with predetermined events in rules. As noted above with respect to claim 1, the

specification discloses and supports automatically selecting tasks. As noted above

with respect to claim 38, the specification discloses and supports that the tasks is

selected based on matching the event with predetermined events defined in the rules.

Accordingly, the specification supports the recited feature. For the above reason, the

rejection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn from dependent claim 12.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks and because no other rejections are pending

against these claims, Applicants respectfully assert that the claims are in condition for

allowance and respectfully request a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this

case. The Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss

any matters to expedite allowance of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/17/06

Marc V. Richards
Registration No. 37,921
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312)321-4200

13